



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PSALMS IX AND X.

MOST commentators are agreed that these two Psalms originally formed one, which was so arranged that it showed the alphabet as an acrostic (Cheyne on Ps. ix and in *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 228; Driver, *Introduction*, &c.; Wellhausen, *Polychrome Bible*, on Ps. x; also Delitzsch, who seems to adopt the Massoretic text as the original one, regards the two Psalms as one (on Ps. x)). They hold that that arrangement has been disturbed by an interpolator, who split the Psalm into two, Ps. x beginning with the letter ז , each half having been so modified as to form an independent whole, and that to those alterations is due the disappearance of the nine initial letters of the acrostic, viz. כ ה ו in Ps. ix and צ פ ע נ ס מ in Ps. x.

Several attempts have been made to restore the alphabetic arrangement, but hitherto without being accepted¹. Perhaps the following effort will, at least in some of its suggestions, receive approval.

A general survey of these Psalms shows them to be arranged in this way, that generally each letter of the alphabet begins a stanza of two lines, each line consisting of two stichs of the ordinary length, i. e. having either three or four beats.

The few exceptions to this order occur just there—as I shall show later on—where the text is disturbed.

It is encouraging to find that there are only three or four stichs less than the above arrangement would require; and when we consider that in other alphabetical Psalms a letter is sometimes entirely omitted, or has only one line instead of two, or shares with another letter the space generally allotted to each single letter, we may hope to be able to ascribe the deficiency of one or two lines to such a cause.

We are further encouraged to pursue our search when we find that by adopting the following method several hidden letters at once shine clearly forth like stars at dusk, and that where the still wanting

¹ See Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 243, note h; and De Wette, *Introd. to Psalm ix.*

letters ought to be according to the same method, there the text is in a state indicating violent disturbance; instead of the missing letters we find their graves, or perhaps the places in which they are concealed.

Our method is to set out for our search from the end of the poem, where the stanzas of ק ר ש ת are found complete, and to work our way backwards by assigning to each alphabetical letter two lines, i. e. four stichs, of three or four beats to the stich, if that is possible without doing violence to the requirements of the poem.

According to that plan there ought to be a word beginning with צ at the commencement of 10a. But what do we find there? Not such a word, but all manner of indications that one or two words have just there fallen out, and that the text is doubtful. The rhythm is defective, for the stich has only two instead of three or four beats; the Greek version (which in Psalms has generally the present Massoretic text) testifies to an uncertainty among the scribes as to the division of the sentences by rendering: ... בְּמִשְׁכוֹ בְּרִשְׁתּוֹ יִרְכֶּה; the sense of the stich is a puzzle to the learned, who even with the help of the Ktib (which they read וִירְכֶּה or וִירְכֶּה) fail to render it satisfactory; moreover, the very fact of there being a variant points to a doubt as to the original reading. All this tends to show that there was an illegible word or two in the copy from which our Massoretic text is derived, and that there was a doubt whether the first legible word was יִרְכֶּה or וִירְכֶּה.

Considering the missing phrase was no doubt a continuation of the scene of hunting down and ensnaring the persecuted, and that it began with צ, what more natural that it was something like צַד or צִפֹּת?

I suggest that the original may have read—

צַד רָשָׁע² יִרְכֶּה וְשָׁח וּנְפֹלוּ ...

“both the crushed and the lowly”; but I prefer to believe that what looked like וִירְכֶּה was really the obliterated or tattered remains of נִרְכֶּה; and also, seeing that בְּרִשְׁתּוֹ בְּמִשְׁכוֹ is of intolerable syntax (“by his pulling *at* his net”: “by his pulling *into* his net”—whom? Wellhausen does not translate them), that the lacuna was really earlier (cp. LXX); that 10a should read וְשָׁח נִרְכֶּה וְצַד, while

¹ In Ps. xxxvii, also alphabetical, the ז stanza, which is of similar import, begins צוּפֶה רֶשַׁע; but that describes a stage in the process of hunting rather too early, and also requires ל after it. For the same reasons צוּפֶה is hardly possible here.

² For changes between final ט and ה cp. מוֹרָה Ps. ix. 21 and נֶחֱה iv. 7.

another word is wanting at the end of ver. 9¹; or that במשכו is a corruption, for this word is very difficult as it stands.

At any rate, I have the mighty support of Cheyne, who assures us that "poetical truth requires here some words which have fallen out at the beginning of the phrase"; and I rejoice to find that he quotes (in the Critical Notes) Bickel, who (perhaps on the same grounds as I) suggests to read צָרוּ רָשָׁע. The צ stanza is thus rendered certain.

Retracing our steps by four and again four stichs, we find at the beginning of 8c עֵינָיו, and of 7a אֱלֹהֵי פִיהוּ, i. e. פ in the second word. That פ should precede צ is of course not alone no obstacle, but a valuable and welcome addition to the same arrangement in Lam. ii, iii, and iv, and Ps. xxxiv. Also the fact that the alphabetical letter does not begin the line is found elsewhere, especially in Nahum i, where י and ל (כ), vers. 6 and 8, are in the second or third word respectively; exactly the same is the case with ד and ש in Sirach, cap. 52. Comp. also צָק in מַצּוּקוֹתֵי, Ps. xxv. 17.

Four stichs earlier we have מ where ד was expected; the use of מִרוֹם is remarkable, but poetically correct, even beautiful and fine; the conception is somewhat like that in Deut. xxx. 11-14, בַּשָּׁמַיִם בְּשִׁמְיָם, "הִיא . . . מִי עֲלֵה הַשְּׁמַיִמָה וְגו' "The Czar is far and God is high," sc. there is no use in appealing for help against oppression; and since there is no מ, nor apparently any trace of it in any of the preceding verses, one might be tempted to suggest that this stanza was intended to bear the מ as initial in disregard of the general order of the alphabet, and that ד was omitted altogether.

It might be objected that מִרוֹם implies an admission that there is a Divine Judge in heaven, while in the previous line the wicked is represented as denying his existence altogether. But vers. 11 and 13 show that 4b is not to be taken strictly in an atheistic sense, but rather to mean that God in heaven will not show himself as a judge. Further, though we can reconcile the sentiment, "There is no God," with subsequent utterances of the ungodly which imply an admission of his existence, it seems too much to have these contrasts as parallel members of the same line.

For all that, having had already evidence that the original text was not always distinctly legible, I surmise that what the copyist read מִרוֹם was really a faded סֵתָם, which is perfectly suitable and yields the ד in its proper place. But even in that case the sublime

¹ If the original was written *συχῶς*, it seems too much to assume that both the end of ver. 9 and the beginning of ver. 10 should have vanished. But perhaps ver. 9 ended as at present, and ver. 10 began צָר בְּרַשְׁתּוֹ, and these words fell out by the so frequent cause of dittology.

force of כִּירוֹם should make us thankful for the mistake of a copyist (or afterthought of the original author) that gave us such a gem. Similarly, the ז line in Ps. xxxiv embodies in its present position, where it refers to the evil-doers and implies repentance and forgiveness, such a superior ethical truth as to render the present arrangement the more acceptable to us.

The stanzas from 5 b to the end of the Psalm as rearranged constitute a perfectly smooth poem, whether with regard to rhythm, sense, or poetical conception, with the exception of 6 b, which conveys no sense whatsoever, and 7 a, which has five beats. We cannot help noticing that the word אֵלֶּה (*curse*) seems somewhat out of place in this connexion, and that at any rate by its removal¹ the line would not suffer, but even greatly gain, for then it would be in itself, and render the rest, perfectly harmonious. How shall we, however, account for the presence of that word? Can we throw it back upon the preceding stich? Seeing that, notwithstanding the great ingenuity bestowed upon that half line by the greatest commentators, the syntax remains an impossible one, and the words of Hitzig, quoted by Delitzsch on Ps. viii, still apply to it, "that no rational man would write so," it is obvious that the addition of another unintelligible word does not alter its status.

I regard these enigmatical words as another proof of my theory that the irregularities and doubts in this poem have arisen from the circumstance that it is derived from a MS. which was, by wear and tear or age, &c., here and there scarcely or not at all legible. And looking at these letters, they call forth by their shapes and constellation the thought that the original of—

אֲשֶׁר לֹא בָרַע אֵלֶּה

was perhaps—

אֲשֶׁרִי לֹא תִמְעַדְנָה

(in three beats), a reading suggested of course by Ps. xxxvii. 31 b (where אֲשֶׁרִי is written so, without ו).

This theory receives ample confirmation from the following facts:—

(a) First and foremost, the new stich supplies a perfect parallel to the former half of the line;

(b) That phrase in Ps. xxxvii is the fourth stich of the פ stanza, just as this one here, both Psalms being formed on the same plan; this very fact, that both are built upon that exceptional system, is a sign of close relationship;

¹ With it the first ו of וּמְרִיבָה must go.

(c) Their correlation is further shown by several other ideas and special phrases and peculiarities being common to both. We notice especially in—

Ps. xxxvii.		Ps. x.	
ver. 5 a	גול על י"י	ver. 14 c	עליך יעזב
7	מזמות	2 & 4	מזמות
12	זומם }		
17	זרועי' רשעי' תשבֿרנה	15 a	שבר זרוע רשע
(10 &) 36	ואבקש' ולא נמצא	15 b	תדרש... בל תמצא
7	במצלי' דרכו	5 a	&c.

The persecution of the innocent by the wicked and the idea that the latter will fall by his own machinations is the common theme of both poems.

But what sets the seal of certainty upon their close intimacy is the peculiar alliteration of the letters (suggestive of their theme) 'ע' ש' ר' in their ר and ש stanzas. In Ps. x. 15, the first ש line has in six consecutive words in each a ר, in four a ש, in four an ע. In Ps. xxxvii, verses 34-36 contain fifteen consecutive words with a ר; vers. 37 and 38 have in their fourteen words seven with a ש and seven with a ר each (an alliteration of ישׂר?).

Resuming our retrogressive march, we seek for נ at 3 b, but there no line could have begun (unless the ו of וּבַצֵּעַ be eliminated); neither can בִּרְךְ be severed from its parallel הִלֵּל; and even if so, it would yield no נ. But if we examine ver. 3, we find its smoothness to be only on the surface; each part of it exhibits the greatest difficulties of syntax and phraseology. הִלֵּל has no object, על has no justification: these two difficulties vanish if for the latter word אַת is substituted; but the sense, though now proper, is not probable. But even more difficult is the task of accounting for בִּרְךְ side by side with נִאֲמֵן; whether we render it, with Cheyne, "blesses," or with Wellhausen, "despises."

Also ver. 4 is extremely difficult. Cheyne renders, "The ungodly in his arrogance . . . 'He will not punish': 'there is no God' is the sum of his thoughts"; and similarly Wellhausen. Cheyne admits that one should expect a verb like אָמַר before בִּל, but assumes a sudden change in the construction, as does Wellhausen. They do not seem to feel anything strange in the phrase נִבְהָ אָפּוֹ (compare "hochnäsigt: die Nase hoch tragen"= overweening pride). One is tempted to think that אָמַר has really fallen out (through being so similar in shape to אָפּוֹ?), and to read as follows:—

(cp. Ps. xviii. 18 and 49¹). Perhaps this line should be read in the past tense (רָאָה, רָאָה) like vers. 5 sqq., 13, 16 sqq.

The ה stanza should begin, according to this method, with 8 a; there is no ה, neither is it possible to disturb that verse. Taking into consideration that if vers. 6 and 7 form the ל stanza there is nothing at all left for the letter ר, we may assume that ver. 9 originally began with הוּא, which yields a ה line, and, besides, gives the verse a beautiful emphasis, which renders the at present somewhat tame sequence of vers. 8–11 full of life and vigour. Vers. 9–11 are, then, three instead of four lines for the combined letters ה and ו², and ver. 8 is the second line of a ר stanza. Here we come to a standstill: for whereas the stanzas of נ and ב are in proper order, as also the line that bears the ל as initial, there is only ver. 7 to represent a second line (if any) of the ל stanza and the first ר line. But, as in most previous cases so here, the place where a letter is lost is marked by the wrecks of stichs and irregularity of rhythm. Does 7a appeal to us as a hopeless cripple? shall its “ruins cease” or abide for ever? how shall we account for the superabundant word (and beat of) הָמָה? I suggest to read, instead of—

הָאֵיב תָּמוּ חֲרֻבוֹת לָנֶצַח

thus:

הָיוּ בְתִימוֹ חֲרֻבוֹת לָנֶצַח

נַחֲשֵׁת is to be rendered, “and the memory of the cities which,” &c.

As to הָמָה, it is perhaps added, repeating the מ in זָכַר, and pressing home the contrast between it and the next word³. It is not to be counted with the rhythmical beats, like e.g. הָיָא in the otherwise strongly rhythmical “Song of the Virtuous Woman,” Prov. xxxi, &c. (Deut. xxxii. 28a suggests to read הָמָה אֲבִירֵי־זָכָר.) If that is correct, ר was never represented at all (except in אֲבִירֵי in 6a?)⁴, and vers. 8 and 9 are the ה stanza with the ה in its second line.

But it is also probable that ver. 7 concluded with זָכַר, and that

¹ In Cod. Alexandrinus there seems to be a dot after the translation of עָנִי, but likewise after that of מִשְׁנֵי; and it is therefore probably only one of the many ink-marks shining through the parchment. On the other hand, the translation of מִשְׁנֵי is written as a separate stich: this points rather to an uncertainty as to which side it belonged.

² Just as in Pss. xxv and xxxiv it is “thrown in” with ה (וַיִּשְׁלַח, וַיִּמְרֹץ) ה, or ק with צ (מִצְדֻקוֹת) in Ps. xxv. 17, and probably נ with ר, ס in Ps. cxlv.

³ Cp. צִמְחוּ אֵי Zach. vii. 5, &c., &c.

⁴ In Nahum i. 4c ר is wanting; but it can scarcely be open to doubt that אֶמֶל is a mistake for רָל, suggested by the last word of that verse.

its theme was continued and developed in a line, now lost, which began with **ו**, and of which **המה** was the last word, the sole survivor from its wreck; and that this lost line with ver. 8 formed originally the **ו** stanza. The force of **המה** was probably just the same as at present.

Cheyne is of opinion that **המה**, followed by a word like **יאבדו**, began ver. 8. That would destroy the rhythm of that verse; but the suggestion supports our theory that there is something fallen out, which with and through **המה** formed the thesis and contrast to ver. 8. The Greek Version rendered, in some unaccountable way, as a noun derived from **הָמָה** to *moan* ("their memory is lost in a moan").

We must not omit to give its full weight to the consideration that either suggested rearrangement yields stanzas in which the component lines form harmonious couplets, viz. according to the former alternative, ix. 6+7, 8+9, and 10+11; according to the latter, vers. 6+7, *+8, 9+10 f. The same applies to our emendations in Ps. x.

There are two more places where it seems that the original text has been affected.

In x. 12, **נִשָּׂא יָדָךְ**, though it reminds us of Deut. xxxii. 41, is strange in its unexplained state. The contrast to the preceding verse suggests the reading, **אֶל־תְּנִישָׁה דָּךְ** (**תְּנִי** or **תְּנִישָׁה**), in complete parallelism with the subsequent stich (or **אֶל־הַשֵּׁב יָדָךְ** (?)). This would also render the rhythm perfect, viz. of three times two beats instead of twice three, a frequent and normal variation.

In x. 14 a and b the rhythm is quite irregular, and the sense of **לָחֵם לָחֵם בִּידָךְ** can only be guessed. Perhaps it should read:—

רִאיתָה אֹתָהּ עֹמֵל וְכַעַם תְּבִיט לָחֵם וּדָךְ, לַחֲמִים דָּרָךְ² or

or instead of **לָחֵם לַחֲמִים** or **לִיתוּם**, compare ver. 18, xxxvii. 18, 37. This would, however, deprive **רִאיתָה** of the grand force of protestation which it now possesses in its position in front of and outside the rhythmical line. For the absolute use of **רִאָה** compare Pss. xxxv. 17, 21, 22; lix. 5, &c.

The reconstructed Psalm would appear somewhat like this (the figures show the number of beats):—

			Ver.		
3	א	3(-4)	א	2	א
3	א	3	א	3	
3		3	בשוב	4	ב

¹ Compare **נִשָּׂא** for **נִשָּׂה**, and altogether the connexion between these verbs, and conversely **מורה** Ps. ix. 21 and **נחה** iv. 7.

² Cp. Pss. xxxvii. 14, cxix. 1.

		Ver.	
3-4	3 (4)	5	
4	4 זערת גוים	6	ג
ועקים נתשת אבד זכרם	היו בתקמו חרבות לנצח	7	
המה			(ד)
כונן למשפט בסאו	וי"י לעולם ישב	8	
ידיו לאמים במישרים	(ו) הוא ישפט תכל בצדק	9	ה
3	ו	10	ו
4	ו	11	ו
3 (4)	ז	12	ז
3-4	4	13	
משנאי תרומקני משערי מות	חנני י"י ראה עניי	14	ח
4	4	15	
4	4 ט	16	ט
4	4	17	
	(הגיון סלה)		
3	3 י	18	י
4	4 כ	19	כ
3	4 קומה י"י	20	
3-4	4		
	(סלה)		
3	4 למה	1	ל (מ)
יתפשנו במזמותיו	בנאות רשע ידלק עני	2	
(or the present text)			
1 לתאות נפשו בצע בצע (ברך)	מחשבותיו הלל רשע	3	מ (מ)
or ברך ובצע	מתהלל רשע על תאות נפשו		
בנבה אפו כל ידרש אלהים	נאץ י"י רשע	4	
דרכו בכל עת (מרום ?)	כל מזמותיו יחילו		
	or		
בנאזה אמר כל ידרש	נאץ י"י רשע		נ
יחילו דרכו בכל עת	אין אלהים כל מזמותיו		
כל צורריו יפיה בהם	סתם משפטיו מנגדו		ס
אמר בלבו כל-אמט לדרודר אשנאי לא תמעדנה			

¹ The *ע* of *על* being a dittography.

		Ver.	
תַּחַת לְשׁוֹנוֹ עָמַל וְאָן	פָּהוּ מֵלֵא מְרֻמּוֹת וְתָךְ	7	פ
בְּמִסְתָּרִים יִהְיֶה נָקִי	יֵשֵׁב בְּמִאֲרֵב חֲצָרִים	8	
יֹאֲרֵב בְּמִסְתָּר כְּאִרְיָה בִּסְכָּה	עֵינָיו לִחְלָכָה יִצְנָנוּ	8c 9a	ע
יִחְטָף עֲנִי ב	יֹאֲרֵב לִחְטוֹף עֲנִי		
(יִחְטָף עֲנִי בְּנִפְלוֹ בְּרִשְׁתּוֹ?)			
חֲלָכָאִים	צָד (צִמְתָּ?) בְּרִשְׁתּוֹ נִדְבָּה וְנָשָׂה, וּנְפָלוּ ב	10	צ
4	3 (4)	11	
אֶל-תִּשְׁכַּח עֲנִיִּים	קוֹמָה יִי, (אֶל-תִּנְשָׂה דָךְ?)	12	ק
4	4	13	
תִּבְטֵם לָתֵם (לְתִמִּים? לִיתוּם)	רָאִיתָה אֶתָּה עָמַל וְכַעַס	14	ר
וְדָךְ (לְתִמִּי-דָךְ)			
יִתוּם אֶתָּה הֵייתָ עוֹזֵר	עֲלִיד יַעֲזֹב חֲלָכָה		
4	3	15	ש
3	4	16	
4	4	17	ת
3 + 2	3	18	

The anomaly in the rhythm of the concluding verse is removed by reading תִּמִּי-דָךְ, or לשַׁפֵּט תִּמִּי-דָךְ as suggested for ver. 14.

If the question is now put, What has caused the disappearance of the alphabetical letters? it will be conceded that it resulted from the dilapidated or faded state of the copy from which our text was derived at the time of fixing the book, during the time of the Second Temple, for the Rabbis of the Mishnah quote the Massoretic text, and the same is closely adhered to in the Greek Version.

It is difficult to imagine a cause for an interpolator to interfere and alter the text, and surely he would have written understandable Hebrew!

Altogether the grounds upon which Cheyne and Wellhausen determine that Psalms ix and x have become independent poems of diverging import do not seem too cogent. Wellhausen sums them up in this way: "For the triumph of Ps. ix lamentation is substituted in Ps. x"; but so it is in Ps. xl, which Wellhausen holds, against Cheyne, to be one, and in Pss. xlv and lxxxix, which neither thinks of dividing. But Wellhausen draws a distinction by adding that the change is made "without any explanation"; but surely there are sufficient and plain intimations of present distress in Ps. ix, viz. vers. 4 b, 14, 18-21 (so that also vers. 2-4 must mean, "I will give thanks

.... when my enemies turn back, when they stumble," &c. = vers. 14 f.). "The distress in Ps. x remains." What of that? has not the poet already expressed his reliance upon Divine succour in Pss. ix and x. 14 sqq., and prays again for it in the end? "The distress in Ps. x appears to be of a different kind, especially in that it is not clear that the enemies are heathen." But Ps. ix calls the persecutors "heathen" and "wicked," vers. 6, 17 and 18, and contrasts with them those who "recognize his name" as **עני** **עני** (עני?), and **אביון** vers. 13 f., 19¹; and uses the simile of "the net" for the persecution, altogether as in Ps. x. The representation of the relation between the persecuting heathen and Israel is peculiar; but that peculiar character is shared by both Psalms, nor confined to them, cp. e.g. Ps. xxii. A modification of the verdict on the question of the unity of these Psalms cannot but influence several other Psalms as well.

Moreover, its division into two is a comparatively modern act. It is probably one of the many ill services which the otherwise so useful introduction of chapters has rendered us.

Probably it arose from there being a blank space between the two divisions; for of course there *is* a division and a contrast between the two halves, marked by " **קיומה** &c. at the end of Ps. ix. The same cause has effected the severance of Pss. xlii and xliii, and Ps. cxlvii, &c.

Cheyne, in his *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 254, shows that till the fourth century Pss. ix and x were counted as one, as in the LXX, by Jewish and Christian tradition. To his evidence from the Talmud (ib. p. 253, note ggg) the remark may be added, that "there are eighteen paragraphs in the statutory prayer, because King David did not speak of Divine response to petitions until after he had uttered eighteen Psalms"; this refers to Ps. xx. 1, Pss. i and ii being also combined². *Talm. Babli*, Berak. f. 9 b; *T. Jerush.*, Berak. ch. 4; *Taanioth*, end of ch. 3; and Midrash and Yalqut on Ps. xx. 1. In those same places, and *Vayigra Rabba*, ch. 7, the Rabbis say that David did not utter the Hallelujah (end of Ps. civ) until he had composed 102³ Psalms.

From the notes (Tosaphoth) of French Rabbis of the tenth century on the Talmudical treatise Megillah, f. 17 b, it is evident that even

¹ The use of **גוי** for hostile nation, as if a single person was meant, is abundant in the Psalms, e.g. xliii, **איש** . . . **גוי**.

² Pss. i and ii are quoted there, after Talmudical fashion, as **אשרי ולמה** **רשע**. Considering that they have nothing in common, it may be that this notion arose out of an earlier Massoretic note to the effect that **אודה** **ולמה**, i. e. Pss. ix and x, though two paragraphs, are one Psalm.

³ W. Heydenheim in the preface to his pocket edition of the Psalms, 1825, shows that the figure **קכ** = 120 is a mistake for **קכ** = 102.

then the Jews counted our two Psalms as one. This twin-Psalm is also still named as "the Psalm" for the Vesper-service during the Feast of Tabernacles (modern Prayer-books) in the Eastern Synagogue, i. e. that of the so-called Spanish or Portuguese ritual; just as Pss. xlii and xliii are there called "the Psalm" for the first day of Passover. If Kimhi yet speaks, in his commentary on the Psalms, of Pss. x and xliii as if they were separate Psalms, it should be remembered that he continually wrote with, for and against, Christians, and that the Jews in his time adopted the chapters, the invention of Christians, for their use.

There is yet some proof for the unity of this poem to be derived from the circumstance that not only Ps. xxxvii, as shown above, but even more so Ps. vii, has several phrases in common with both. Even supposing that Pss. vii and xxxvii borrowed from Ps. ix and x, it is not likely that both should borrow so much from the same two Psalms.

Ps. vii.		Ps. ix.	
ver. 18 a =		אודה י"י 2 a	
18 b		אזמרה שם עליון 3 b	
(end of this Psalm.)		(beginning of this Psalm.)	
cp. 7 c, 9 a b.		משפמי ודיני 5 a	
שופט צדיק 13		שופט צדק 5 b	
10 ותכונן		כונן 7-8)	
8, 9 לאמים, ידין עמים		ידין לאמים 9	
10 יגמר רע רשעים	{	16 טבעו . . . בשחת עשו ברשת כו' (and	{
16 ויפל בשחת יפעל		בפעל כפי' נוקש רשע	
17 ישוב עמלו ג' וחמסו ג'		x. 2 b) (יתפשו במזמור' חשבו ?)	
7 =		קומה י"י 20	
		(and x. 12)	
		Ps. x.	
15 לדולקים		ידלק 2	
(ל? "for the persecutors" ?)			
16 און . . . עמל		עמל ואון 8	
(cp. 6) 3 =		יטרף כאריה 9	
		the same simile, in like words.	
10 בור בר' ויחפר' — Alliterations in ר		שבור ג' 15	

NOTE.—ON WORDS IN POEMS OUTSIDE THE RHYTHM.

Nahum i belongs to that class of poems in which the stich has normally three or two beats¹. In the first two verses (vers. 2 f.) of that poem the apostrophe (י') is not to be counted in the number of beats. The same applies to Habakkuk's prayer, iii. 2. (Sinker's method of dividing that verse into a strictly three-beating rhythm is ingenious, but not poetically correct.)

An undeniable witness of such licence is וַאֲמַר in Job xxxviii. 11 a, for though that word could be forced, together with the rest, to form four beats, it would be intolerably closely packed. רִאִיתָהּ (and אַתָּה ?) in Ps. x. 14 (as the text stands) is of great power as an independent exclamation. Of the same nature appear to be וַאֲמַר Deut. xxxii. 20, רִאֵה עֲתָה, ver. 39, and וַאֲמַרְתָּ ver. 40 (compare their chaunting notes); likewise הִנֵּה Job iii. 7 (cp. ver. 6) and הִיא in Prov. xxxi. 30². There are probably many more instances.

NAHUM I AND THE AGE OF ALPHABETICAL ACROSTICS.

The question whether alphabetical acrostics may be admitted to be of pre-exilic times depends largely upon the question whether Nahum i is arranged alphabetically. Driver, in his *Introduction to the Literature*, &c., leaves this doubtful, because the traces of such arrangement are not sufficiently decided. But with the aid of the following synopsis all doubt will disappear.

Nahum i rhythmically tabulated, with number of beats.

						ver.
3	וּנוֹמֵר	3	נוֹקֵם	4	נוֹקֵם	2 אֶלְקִינוּא
3	וְעֵנָן	3	בְּסוֹפָה (י')	3	וְנָקָה	3 (י') אֶרֶךְ
3	אֶמְלֵל... אֶמְלֵל	3	אֶמְלֵל (י'?)	3	וְכָל	4 נֹעֵר
3	וְחָבַל	3	וְחָשָׂא	2	וְהִגְבַּעְוֹת	5 הָרִים
(but full. התמוגגו						

(but full. התמוגגו)

¹ In such poems the first lines are frequently fuller, as here ver. 2, e.g. Deut. xxxii.

² Where יָרָא seems more correct.

³ Probably the original word was וַל; the last word of the verse was in the mind of a copyist.

3	והצרים	3	המתו	4	ומי	4	לפני-זעמו	6
3		3	וירע	3	למעוז	2	טוב	7
3		3	ואויביו	3	כלה	2	ובשטף	8
3		3	לא-	3	כלה	2-3	מה-	9
(Does מלא belong to the next line?)				4	אכלו	4	כי עד סירים ס' ובכם	10
2		3	יועץ בליע'	2	חושב עליי רע'	2	ממך	11

Here follow four verses in prose, but full of alliteration; also ch. ii, which is first rhythmical but in stichs of five (and 3 + 2) beats, contains alliteration which roughly, but none the less unmistakably, continues the alphabetical arrangement, viz.:

12 וכן נגזו ועבר וענתיך לא אענך עוד (13 וע'... מע' ומוס' אנ')
 14 וצוה עליך... פסל ומסכה... קברך... קלות.

Chapter ii takes up the thread from where ch. i. 11 dropped it.

Ch. ii.

1 לא יוסף עוד לעבר... בליעל...
 2 עלה מפין על פנ' נצור מצורה צפה... חזק... אמיץ...
 3 בקקום בוקקים, ומוריהם שחתו.

Query: Is it imitation or mere chance that this alliterative prophecy and two in Isaiah (xvii. 9-11 and xxv. 1-5) finish the alliteration by the root זמר (twice 'זמור')?

PS.—While this article was passing through the press its author had a long denied opportunity of consulting Prof. Abbott's essay on the same subject in *Hermathena* of 1890. He found in that instructive essay several of his emendations either anticipated or nearly approached. Thus Prof. Abbott not only quotes a proposal to read אשרי for אשר but adds that אלה may have originally formed one word with ברע ("of the root רעל"), thus allowing פיהו to begin the פ stanza. He also cites an emendation מתהלל for x. 3, and remarks that it lies nearer to find the מ in the word כי.

M. BERLIN.